UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

On the Duty to Be Free

By HENRY R. MUSSEY

The Economic Factor in the Messiahship of Jesus

By CHARLES C. RAMSAY

The American Friends Withdraw from Germany

By BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Colonel Charles Young

By FREDERICK STARR

VOLUME LXXXIX NUMBER 3

Chicago, March 16, 1922

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
HENRY R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCES L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
" COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
CANADA—Sidney Snow
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss)_____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 35
On the Duty to Be Free.—HENRY R. MUSSEY.. 37

ARTICLES—
The Economic Factor in the Messiahship of Jesus.—CHARLES C. RAMSAY..... 39
The American Friends Withdraw from Germany.—BRENT DOW ALLINSON..... 41
Colonel Charles Young.—FREDERICK STARR.... 43
Economic Progress in India.—J. W. PETAVEL.. 45
Patriotism.—*William M. Salter*..... 45
The Rule of Chaos.—*M. H. Hedges*..... 46

CORRESPONDENCE—
Learning Through Experience.—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 46
The Turkish-Armenian Question.—MARY C. TRASK 46

POETRY—
A Psalm.—*Victor E. Southworth*..... 35
At the Concert.—HARRIET LAKE-BURCH..... 46

THE FIELD—
A Tribute to E. D. Morel.—*Baron Rosen*..... 47
Announcement—"Woman in the Progress of Civilization."—*George Willis Cooke*..... 47
The American Language.—*Issues of Today*.... 47

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXIX. THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1922 NUMBER 3

A PSALM.

Betake yourself to the thought of God as to a strong tower.
Delight in His love as the parched fields in the summer rain.
Attend to the beauty with which He clothes the earth.
Hearken to His Voice within all voices, and learn of His greatness in the least of things.
There is no immensity He doth not fill, and no heart too lowly for His dwelling place.
Whatever befall you, let it be a reminder of His care.
Go with reverence into all temples and learn of His wisdom in every creed.
His presence sanctifies the humble place and His splendor lightens the heavens.
There is no wisdom or love apart from Him.
Tell of His goodness all ye people, and be at one in His truth:
So shall ye have quietness and an abiding peace.

—*Victor E. Southworth.*

Col. Repington, in the latest installment of his endless "Diary," repeats a clever *bon mot* of M. Clemenceau. Speaking after an operation for appendicitis, the great Frenchman is reported by the Englishman as having said, "There are only two perfectly useless things in the world, an appendix and M. Poincare." That the French Premier is "useless" in the sense that he serves no useful purpose, we agree. But that he is "useless" in the sense that he serves no purpose at all, is not true. Poincare *does* serve a purpose, and a very wicked one—that of an imperialism as brutal, if by no means as efficient, as that of Hohenzollern Prussia. It is this which makes Clemenceau's coupling of Poincare with an appendix, so absolutely pat. The French Premier in the body of Europe is exactly what the appendix is in the body of a human being—a source of aggravation, inflammation, and death if not removed. The recent agreement with Lloyd-George on the proposed Genoa Conference is a case in point. Poincare first called off the Conference altogether. Then, in his dickering with the English Prime Minister, he sold his consent to the Conference at a price which renders it utterly futile. On the terms imposed by the Frenchman, the Genoa gathering, as the *New Republic* (March 8) clearly states, "cannot bring either political stability or economic recovery to Europe." The old game of ruin, in other words, continues. It is a desperately discouraging situation—as discouraging as the plight of the invalid who is told by his physician that he is at death's door, and cannot survive unless he is willing to have his appendix removed! But there is hope as well as despair in the statement—*if the hope is acted upon!!*

One knows not whether to pray for the downfall of the Lloyd-George ministry or not. From the standpoint of moral sanitation, we would gladly see Lloyd-George retire, for we have reached the point where we believe him to be the most dishonest man in public life today. On the other hand, he is too clever not to understand what is going on in Europe, too acute intellectually not to know what must be done to salvage civilization, and too self-conscious of "the main chance" not to do this thing if it can be done. For all his instability, he seems to be the one man among the Allies who offers any promise of finding a way out of the existing impasse. To think of his being succeeded by Balfour, or Austen Chamberlain, or even by Asquith or Grey, is simply horrific. From the standpoint of ultimates, of course, the British Labor Party still remains the one sure hope of England, and perhaps of Europe. But even the present amazing bye-elections do not convince us that, in a general election, the Labor Party could win a clear mandate to power, and we have to confess that our confidence in the leadership of this party has of late been sadly shaken. What we are facing, after all, in this matter of leadership in western Europe, is a condition of bankruptcy. The War and the Peace together swept the board clean of all our so-called great men. Lloyd-George alone survives by reason of a certain mental agility and moral adjustability (i. e., unscrupulousness) which combine to make him the master opportunist of modern times. One has pretty exact measure of the character of an age which has to rely upon a Lloyd-George for salvation!

Speaking of Lloyd-George reminds us of Ireland, and that again stirs us to wonder what has become of that old yarn about the situation between England and Ireland being the same as the situation in 1861

between North and South in this country. In this version of the Irish tale, Lloyd-George was cast in the exalted role of Abraham Lincoln! Suddenly, however, the comparison is dropped—we no longer hear anything about it. Can this be because Abraham Lincoln did not invite Confederate commissioners to Washington, did not negotiate with them on equal terms, and did not finally recognize the South as a "Free State" with independent sovereignty of its own? We rather suspect something of the kind—which leads us further to suspect that the parallel with the South was nothing but "bunk" from the beginning. And yet sober men and respectable journals used it persistently!

England's announcement of independence for Egypt is gratifying, but not to be taken as indicating any sudden change of heart in the British government. Egypt is being released, with all imperial interests duly safeguarded and perpetuated, only that India may be the more securely held in bondage. India, in other words, is now the focal point of British imperial policy, just as India has always been the keystone of the Empire itself. India must be held at any cost—this country, with its vast trade resources and inexhaustible natural wealth, once lost by any chance, and the whole structure of the Empire must collapse! Egypt, therefore, is a small price paid for the great reward of India. The grant of independence, just announced, has special bearing on the Mohammedan situation as affecting the Indian nationalistic movement. The Moslem world, of course, is being swept from end to end with unrest, and at the bottom of all the trouble is hatred of the Allies, and more particularly of England, for the dismemberment of Turkey at the close of the Great War. Now it is this unrest which Gandhi, by a marvelous stroke of statesmanship, is organizing in support of the liberation of his people from the British yoke. For the first time in the history of India, Mohammedan and Hindu have buried their differences, and are standing united in the common cause of national independence. To break this amazing alliance, to divide and rule, is the deliberate policy of the British government at this moment, and Egypt is only one move in the campaign.

Lloyd-George in a recent speech in the House of Commons said that the trouble in Egypt and India was due to the fact that the peoples of these countries had imbibed western ideas of democracy, and that emphasis in the war on the right of self-determination had awakened their nationalism. It would seem that Mr. George's recent experience with Ireland would suggest to him, that, no matter what England's material interests may be, or what the desire of the English people to lead into paths of political rectitude subject peoples, these fundamental ideas cannot be repressed or even guided by a dominant race. There is more explosive power in an idea than in all the TNT in the world. If you want to keep a man a slave you should not let him even dream of freedom. But the trouble lies in the fact that neither Mr. George nor any other man can control dreams. They can prohibit the importation of goods and even guns, but dreams elude them, especially when dreams are in the air. When Henry the Fifth spoke, "The air, a chartered libertine, is still," said the Archbishop of Canterbury. But there are no Henrys today to calm that "chartered libertine." Democracy is in the air. The peoples of India and of Egypt feel its invigorating touch. Perhaps some day Lloyd-George and all the rest of the imperialists in England and elsewhere may learn that if they are going to control subject peoples and thwart the aspirations of a people for freedom that they will have to learn Henry the Fifth's secret of controlling the air.

When the war was on, we could never reconcile ourselves to what was to us the hideous fact that government *forced* people to *give* their *lives* to the country, but only *invited* them to *loan* their *money*. If there was to be any conscription in this war business, we felt that it should begin with wealth and not with lives. In any case, human beings should not be conscripted unless bank accounts are conscripted, or confiscated, at one and the same time! This matter is now brought to our attention again by a recent statement by Mr. Clynes, the English labor leader, as to how this works out in post-war obligations. In a speech at Bradford (England), Mr. Clynes informed his audience that since the Armistice, the British government has paid out £350,000,000 a year as *interest* to people who *lent money* for the war, and £110,000,000 a year to those who *gave life, limb or health* for the war. Could anything be more insane than this? Could anything reveal more clearly the basic materialism of our civilization, and the reason why wars are possible? Money is sacred!—so sacred that it cannot be touched nor ever received as a gift, but must be borrowed and paid for at a generous rate of interest. Life, *per contra,* is worth nothing!—it is cheap, so cheap that it can be seized like so much dirt and thrown away at random! If we had our way, we would have war paid for, not only in blood but in *money,* by the people who make it. Incidentally, we think this would stop war at once and for good!

The production of Bernard Shaw's "Back to Methuselah," by the Theatre Guild of New York, stands without question as one of the most remarkable achievements in the history of the American stage.

When it was announced last fall that the production was to be undertaken, students of Shaw smiled indulgently, and advised the directors of the Guild to read the play. This play was in reality no less than five plays, running in book form to no less than three hundred closely printed pages. Think of putting such a drama on the boards! But the Theatre Guild *did* think of it, and *did* carry the project through. They had to arrange the performances in cycles of three nights each, to be sure, in the traditional Chinese fashion; they had to organize and drill separate companies for the separate acts or plays; they had to print tickets that looked like the season pasteboards for the opera or the symphony. But they did these extraordinary things without flinching and, what is more important, performed the drama with a degree of artistic success which left the critics breathless. It was an astounding achievement, worthy of fervent admiration. And yet, when all is said and done, was it anything more than a "stunt" like climbing the face of a skyscraper, or walking over Niagara on a tight rope? Our own feeling is that "Back to Methuselah" was no more written for production than the Dialogues of Plato, and we confess surprise that Shaw was willing to have it acted. In structure, style, content, it is pre-eminently a play to be read and not seen, for the closet and not the stage. The study of the work in book form is an exhilarating experience, both intellectually and spiritually. Even the friendliest observers confessed that the production, admirable as it was in every detail, was a bore. How could it have been otherwise? The Guild, for all its success, would have done better had it refrained!

Developments in the Baptist Church are full of interest, and will well bear watching. This denomination, thanks to its traditions and its congregational system of ecclesiastical government, enjoys a degree of freedom which is almost unknown in other orthodox Protestant bodies. It has held within its fold men as far asunder as the poles in their beliefs and mental habits—as witness three such diverse types as President Faunce of Brown University, Dr. Haldeman of the First Baptist Church in New York City, and John Roach Straton. The sudden and convulsive eruption within the body, however, of a pre-millennialite movement of amazing proportions, threatens to strain the organization to the breaking-point. A real crisis seems to be at hand. Either the liberal elements will maintain control—in which case the pre-millennialites will withdraw, to save themselves from contamination with such heretics; or else the pre-millennialites will capture the denomination, and use their power to banish unbelievers. In either case, the church will be rent asunder, and liberty thus be slain in the house of her friends. It is a tragic situation, to be attributed to nothing else in the world but that recrudescence of superstition and bigotry which followed after the Great War in place of that great spiritual revival for which we all were looking. Of course it is still possible, especially in a church with such traditions as that of the Baptist Church, that the two wings may manage to hold together; it is amazing how common-sense asserts itself on occasion at the last moment. But miracles are getting rarer every day, and we shall continue to hope rather than expect a happy outcome of this sad quarrel.

On the Duty to Be Free

In their remarkable book on "The Town Laborer," Mr. and Mrs. Hammond point out strikingly the spiritual revolt of the early factory workers against the iron discipline of the machine. The suspicion and fear of those days were not unjustified. For a hundred and fifty years since, the machine has been at work to make men more alike; and with the improvement in means of communication, its standardizing influence has spread to the most remote corners of the earth. Today it is well-nigh impossible to escape from the motor car, the movie and the victrola. Increasingly all men everywhere do the same work and eat the same food and wear the same clothes and sing the same songs and think the same thoughts. We have abolished the horrors of the early factory system, but a greater spiritual horror looms before us.

When our spirit of democratic social reform shall have done its perfect work, then apparently we are to look forward down a long vista of centuries tenanted by countless multitudes of healthy, happy, altruistically minded, well-kept young men and women, all wearing the latest model of Arrow collars or Venida hair nets, working six to eight hours a day in perfectly appointed factories and shops and offices, returning at the end of the day in Fords to homes that were built out of the *House Beautiful* or mail order catalogues, getting their recreation by going five evenings a week to see Doug and Mary on the silver screen, cultivating their alleged minds by the regular perusal of the *Saturday Evening Post* and the Sunday papers (not less than three), and finally when in a ripe old age they are overtaken by a respectable and sanitary death, enjoying all the comforts of a standard two-hundred-fifty-dollar funeral, as advertised, with carriages and flowers furnished, and the services of ——'s mortuary chapel thrown in free if desired. And this horror our fire-breathing lightning-controlled servant-master is spreading all over the world—in Boston and New Orleans, in London and Bucharest, in Tokyo and Teheran and Tahiti and Timbuctoo. In despair one repeats, but in

another sense, the cry of the Psalmist, "Whither shall I flee from thy presence?"

But this is not all. The printing press, the telegraph and the telephone have immensely strengthened the hand of our governors, political, economic and spiritual, and the war has taught them valuable lessons. Today an official in Washington pushes a button, and tomorrow a hundred million people believe that the Bolsheviks have passed a constitutional amendment for boiling their grandmothers in oil. A banker called six men together at luncheon on Friday, and on Monday morning five hundred thousand laborers set to work on a new railroad that will girdle the globe; that afternoon there is a conference of a dozen trade-union officials, and at noon on Tuesday every one of the half million lays down his tools. Like the centurion of the gospel story, all of us nowadays expect to be men set under authority—the authority, for the most part, not of a person, but of a system and scheme of things bigger than any person. Without much questioning we accept at its hands our job, our conditions of work and life, our habits of consumption, our very emotions and our thoughts—if we can call them thoughts. And we think ourselves free.

Perhaps we need another Thoreau to teach us again the duty of civil disobedience, or a new Emerson to remind us day in day out that whoso would be a man must be a nonconformist. Certainly the material and social forces against whose domination they proclaimed the right and duty of individual self-assertion are working today far more widely and effectively than was the case in the second third of the nineteenth century. No less certainly the task of independent thought and action has become increasingly difficult as the enginery for producing conformity has been perfected.

Revolt of a kind we have, but it is not revolt we need. Revolt is born of weakness and fear and inadequacy. The feeble folk who are clamoring for "self expression," and who therefore desert their wives for new spiritual affinities, or who refuse to keep their houses clean and pay their debts and wash their faces in order thus to throw off the tyranny of mid-Victorian bourgeois conventions, are an unmitigated public nuisance. For the most part they lack both brains and morals, to say nothing of manners. The honest and conscientious, but withal professional "radical," be it said with all respect, performs only a less disservice. Freedom does not consist in being perpetually conscious of your own limitations and forever kicking vainly against them. Finally, the great muttering revolt of the disinherited, that occasionally flares up, does not evidence an appreciation even of the existence of the task here suggested. The cry for justice, even the passionate demand for freedom, means too largely a dissatisfaction over financial inability to live up to (that is, conform to) standards of expenditure and conduct which are accepted without question as good and desirable. There is no salvation in revolt.

What we need is free men and women, men and women free here and now. In a profound sense, a man is as free as he thinks he is, provided he be a real person. If he feels as though he were free, and acts as though he were free, in so far he is free. Let him act without fear of consequences, and for the most part he will discover that consequences return to plague only the coward. But let him maintain withal no sneaking reserve of apprehension, whether it be of social disapproval or of loss of livelihood, or even of jail and the gallows; for if at bottom of his heart he fear them, then is he not free. The first condition of freedom is moral, the perfect love that casteth out fear. But the free man carries no chip on his shoulder; he does not live in the spirit of revolt; he is engaged in no struggle against social limitations. Are they good? He observes them. Are they bad? He ignores them.

But the duty of freedom involves an intellectual task far more exacting in its details than is the moral requirement. It demands a constant mental awareness, a cat-like mental agility. With his ideal of life forever present in mind, the free man must subject to sleepless critical observation and to constant evaluation each one of the vast complex of forces that the machine and modern society bring to bear upon the individual to make him think and feel and act in certain ways. The free man must prove all things, and hold fast that which is good. He will neither accept nor reject a practice, an idea, or a standard because it is thrust upon him by the machine or urged upon him by the crowd or imposed upon him by the government. He will accept it because it makes for life as he knows life, or will reject it because its fruit is spiritual death, no matter how it be acclaimed in the market place or the forum.

Such a man will be keenly alive intellectually, as the sole condition on which he can be free. He will be calm and unafraid, and he will be himself. Respecting himself as a person, developing his own capacities, he will become, like every unspoiled creation of God, a true unique, an embodiment of one bit of that infinite variety which gives the world its delight and its deep underlying unity. Himself a free man, in this world of here and now, by his thought, his belief, and his practice he will help emancipate his companions from the bondage out of which they vainly seek release through systems and through struggle.

If we can cease for a moment from our passionate war against wrong and injustice, can let our reforming zeal cool just long enough to listen to the still small voice, may it not perhaps whisper in our ear that the supreme duty of today is the duty to be free?

HENRY R. MUSSEY.

The Economic Factor in the Messiahship of Jesus

Under the above caption there appeared in *The Christian Register* of February 2, 1922, an article by Dr. T. N. Carver, professor of economics in Harvard University, which is sufficiently novel in viewpoint and conclusions to warrant a somewhat critical review.

The chief conclusions reached by the professor in his article are these: Jesus, brooding over the oppression of his people by inferior, barbaric conquerors, made it the principal purpose of his life to discover and teach the successful means and method of his people's deliverance from their oppressors. This purpose he accomplished by recognizing and teaching that his people must become a strong and materially prosperous nation, which was to be achieved by their so applying God's laws governing physical nature and human nature as to prevent all waste of matter and force, all economic goods, and all human energy and intelligence, to the efficient end of *production,* and *even more production.* Thus would the Jewish and all other nations adopting Jesus' means and method become great, prosperous and free; and this, says the professor, will be the "Kingdom of God."

If the foregoing be true, it seems strange that Jesus himself in his superior wisdom did not teach a body of economic doctrine to his people; for, if his Messiahship consisted chiefly of such principles, surely their salvation required from him a thorough exposition of a sound and complete economic system. But stranger still is the historic fact that, although the Jews rejected his Messiahship and refused or neglected to apply many of his teachings, they have survived; while the Babylonians, Egyptians, Grecians, and Romans, who achieved great national strength and economic prosperity, have perished almost "without a trace."

Passing over the Professor's astonishing implication that Jesus was an intense nationalist and a strong materialist, contrary to centuries of Christian belief that whether practicable or impracticable he taught a universal, international, idealistic, and spiritual religion, and pausing only for a moment strongly to approve the Professor's assertion that the *utilization of natural* law is the only means and hope of *human progress,* let me ask and attempt to answer the question: Do the reported teachings of Jesus support the Professor's contentions and conclusions? If so, then how can they be harmonized with the following quotations from Jesus's recorded utterances?

> Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt and where thieves do not break through and steal. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.—Matt. VI, 19-21.
>
> No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. Therefore, I say unto you: Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not life more than meat and the body more than raiment?—Matt. VI, 24, 25.

In the remaining verses of the chapter last above quoted, it is stated that Jesus bade his hearers to "consider the lilies" that neither toil nor spin but are sustained and clothed by God, and asked whether he would not much more surely sustain and clothe his human children; and he then added, "For after these (material) things do the Gentiles seek." Matt. VI, 32.

> And seek not what ye shall eat and what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind; for all these things do the nations of the earth seek after, but rather seek ye the kingdom of God. Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.—Luke XII, 29-32.

From this it appears that, contrary to the Professor's assertion, the "kingdom of God" is something in sharp contrast with national strength and material prosperity; and that, moreover, it is something which God freely *gives* to his worthy children.

In Luke XVI, 19-31, Jesus told the story of the rich man and the beggar, Lazarus; and, though not explicitly charging the former with any wrong (but doubtless Jesus meant to imply that the rich man sinned by his enjoyment of great wealth amidst surrounding poverty and suffering), after the death of the rich man and the beggar the former suffered torments in hell while the latter was carried to Abraham's bosom in paradise.

> And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples: How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God? It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. —Mark X, 23, 25.
>
> For a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.—Luke XII, 15.

To the man in Jesus's story who had heaped up much goods and many fruits of production, to hold which he had to build larger storehouses, God said:

> Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided? So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God.—Luke XII, 20, 21.

Indeed, believing and teaching as Jesus did (in Matt. XXIV, 3-35) that the end of all mundane things and the salvation of the few righteous persons past and present (see Matt. VII, 13, 14) would be consummated in his own generation, he preached an individual rather than a social gospel. In this, he was both logical and consistent; for, if the end of the world was so soon to occur, social, political, and economic reforms were wholly unnecessary, while individual purity and righteous conduct were all-essential to eternal salvation.

The Professor cited the parable of the talents (see Matt. XXV, 14-30) as proof that Jesus taught the righteousness of charging *interest* on loans of money; which, if true, would contradict Deuteronomy XXIII, 19: "Thou shalt not lend money upon *usury* to thy brother,—usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury." ("Usury" in the Bible is equivalent to our word "interest"; and Rabbi Wise states that the Jews did not charge one another interest until six or seven hundred years ago.) However, the taking of usury from strangers was permitted to the Jews by the next verse; and probably Jesus had the latter fact in mind when he illustrated by this parable his approval of the increase of one's God-given mental and moral powers by the beneficent use thereof in one's daily life, which I believe to be his sole meaning.

Moreover, it must be remembered that the maker of a parable does not necessarily affirm the righteousness of every element of the example which he cites to enforce a moral lesson. For example, I venture to think that the Professor would not cite Jesus's parable of the vineyard (see Matt. XX, 1-16) in support of

the principles of modern political economy or of the economic soundness of Jesus; wherein the laborers who began their work at the eleventh hour were paid as much money as those who had worked all day, although in verses 4 and 7 the master of the vineyard had promised to all "Whatsoever is right, I will give you." However, in this surmise regarding the Professor, I may be wrong; for he may wink at the unsound economics and questionable ethics of the parable, in order to take advantage of the "freedom of contract" for which he in his article and elsewhere and other ardent supporters of our present economic and commercial system so strongly contend. Because, when the other laborers complained to the master about his equal payment to the eleventh-hour workers,

> He answered one of them and said, Friend, I do thee no wrong; for didst thou not agree with me for a penny? Take that which is thine, and go thy way. I will give unto this last even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?—Verses 13-15.

This may have been sanctioned by the civil law; but was it moral, according to the canons of modern ethics, for a man to do as he pleased with his property regardless of social justice?

However, it must be hard for the Professor, even to save the "freedom of agreement," to approve the principle of "equal pay for unequal work," which he probably regards as socialistic; although, as a matter of fact, it must be classed with other principles of pseudo-socialism. Without here holding a brief for socialism, but with a desire to do it justice, I believe that a good case may be made out for the claim that in practice Jesus was a socialist, as the Christian Socialists hold that he was also in theory. Inasmuch as he knew that material goods were then, as now, essential to human existence, why did he *condemn* in some of the parables above quoted the *individual possession* of *wealth* if he did not believe in *community production, savings,* and *wealth* as a substitute for individual production, savings, and wealth?

I neither here affirm nor deny that the teachings of Jesus hereinbefore quoted are either ideally true or humanly practicable; but I assert that they express his views of material things and economic prosperity in contradiction of the Professor's opinions of Jesus's ideas upon the subject. It is to be presumed that Jesus knew better than anyone else what he thought and felt upon any subject of which he spoke; and I affirm that he said what he meant, and I will add that I am quite familiar with the various ways by which attempts are often made to "explain away" or evade the plain meaning of scriptures which is opposed to the expositor's theories. I refer to the mystical, the poetic, the figurative or symbolic, and the linguistic methods of scriptural interpretation often employed but rarely by disinterested seekers after truth.

I suspect that the Professor's well-known advocacy of individualism and keen opposition to socialism are responsible for his seeing in the teachings of Jesus support for his social and economic theories which said teachings do not contain, and for his ignoring whatever in them contradicts his own theories.

Like many other writers on economics and ethics, the Professor has not explicitly stated in his article the true and ultimate goal of human life and its manifold activities; either from sheer neglect or because such goal is not clear in his own mind. However, in his essay, his notion of such end is implicit, viz.: National strength and prosperity are the supreme desiderata, to which production and ever more production without waste of matter and energy are essential; hence, vast and economical production is the supreme means of attaining the goal of human existence. To this I reply that history tells the story of many now extinct ancient and mediaeval nations that were prosperous and powerful, but which bore no resemblance to the "kingdom of God." I hasten, however, to offer a profounder objection to the above correct inference from the Professor's article, as follows:

He forgets or more probably rejects the most fundamental, most dominant, of all ethical truths: The *ever present* and *ultimate* end of *all sentient existence* is the *maximum of righteous happiness;* all thoughts, feelings, and acts which promote such maximum are *right* thoughts, feelings, and acts; and all thoughts, feelings, and acts which accomplish less than that are *wrong.* I am well aware of the many earnest and often bitter objections to hedonism and *utilitarianism* made by metaphysicians, theologians, and other *intuitionists;* but they have no weight with me, because after no inconsiderable study of ethics and psychology I have decided that anyone who rejects the philosophy of utility (which was not correctly stated by either Bentham or Mill) is befogged by words expressing no reality or experience cognizable by the human mind, of which metaphysics in no small measure consists, or is not intellectually candid, or does not understand the philosophy of utility.

Utilitarianism, however, does not allege that anyone or all sentient beings will ever permanently attain perfect happiness in this world; but it does hold that happiness is no mere by-product of sentient life, but that it is the only end of supreme universal interest to all sentient beings, the only ultimate object of universal quest, the *only end* which *never becomes the means* to a *still further end.* Moreover, utilitarianism is the only conception of "ethics" which will enable it to become a true *science* of moral progress (based upon observation and experiment, as are the physical sciences, which are responsible for material progress, of which the correlative arts are the various branches of engineering); of which ethical science, "morals," is the correlative art or practical application. When applied to individual or collective life, to industry and commerce and politics, utilitarianism (which means not the conscious seeking of one's own happiness but of the greatest totality of happiness in one's community, one's country, and the world) becomes the guide and goal of all personal and corporate conduct, all legislation, all jurisprudence, all national life, and all international relations, and extends even to the welfare of the lower animals.

The controlling ethical principle above stated is, moreover, based upon a universal psychological fact already alluded to, viz.: All normal sentient beings of which we have any knowledge consciously or unconsciously seek pleasure, or happiness, and likewise try to avoid pain, or unhappiness; but it must be remembered that it often requires long and severe discipline to teach one what will promote one's real and durable happiness. However, the chief use by an individual of his knowledge of such psychological fact is to enable him morally to relate himself to his fellow-creatures, which he can do only by so living as to promote their maximum righteous happiness. If, however, any pleasure-hater should fear that utilitarianism in prac-

tice would make the world too soft and comfortable for mankind, I assure him that unhappiness uncaused by or independent of human agency (arising from man's necessity of adjusting himself to his physical environment) would still exist sufficient in volume and intensity to satisfy the most zealous joy-killer.

Now thus far in human experience, the work of production has been more or less painful and is likely so to continue but in decreasing degree with the increased extension of mechanical power in the form of new machinery; but there is something, on the other hand, which is pleasurable, viz., *consumption*. However, notwithstanding that consumption fills as large and as important a place in human life as do production and exchange, it is passing strange that the Professor and many other popular economists have little or nothing to say about it. Probably, their belittling of consumption as a vital economic and ethical fact (as promoting human happiness) explains why they do not know that socialists advocate "socialism in production" but "individualism in consumption"; and that, therefore, socialists strongly contend for *personal liberty* in the consumption of all material and spiritual goods beneficial to man.

In a foregoing paragraph, I said that human progress depended upon the *utilization* of the *laws of nature* and of *human nature*. Note that I did not say *obedience* to such laws; because some of them are not always beneficent to man in their unregulated operations, in which case it is man's business to manipulate or harness them up for human welfare, or for men so to relate themselves to such natural laws as to obtain from their operations the maximum of happiness under the circumstances. Such results has man accomplished, in large measure, as regards the laws of gravitation and of electricity; and I am bold enough to assert that the same can and will be done regarding the "law of supply and demand," so immutable, so inexorable, and so sacred to conservative political economists.

Boston, Mass. CHARLES C. RAMSAY.

The American Friends Withdraw from Germany

("Quaker Feeding" to Be Continued.)

"The Quakers are going home!" That remark, uttered regretfully, may be heard in many parts of Germany to-day. After providing more than two hundred million warm meals to school-children whose undernourished condition has been determined in every case by medical examination, in over a thousand cities, villages and towns throughout the German Republic, the American Friends are going home. The American representatives of the Friends Service Committee are being withdrawn from Germany and transferred in part to Russia where the need for the generous relief they have to give, irrespective of any political or sectarian consideration, is far more desperate. They will, however, continue to maintain supervision of the feeding of German school children, by means of a board of trustees resident in Berlin, as long as any American money continues to be spent for this purpose. The chairman of this board of five is Mr. Francis R. Bacon, formerly instructor in architecture at the University of Pennsylvania, who succeeded to the chairmanship of the Quaker relief mission in Germany after the retirement of Alfred G. Scattergood last July.

The work which the Friends began more than two years ago will be continued by arrangements which have been concluded with the German Department of Food. A bureau of the Food Ministry, called the Central Committee for Foreign Relief, which was originally established for the purpose of co-ordinating and assisting the efforts which the many foreign relief agencies began in Germany shortly after the armistice, has taken over the direction of the large Quaker child-feeding program and will continue the humanitarian work as part of the social welfare activity of the German Republic at least until the next harvest and probably longer. The American Friends, whose headquarters are at 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, have agreed to supply approximately 40 per cent of the necessary funds for this continuance until August first and the German government has appropriated 100,000,000 marks to defray the remaining 60 per cent of the cost of the food-stuffs used while the expenses of cooking and distributing the warm food to the thousand of school feeding-centers will be borne, as in the past, in part by the local municipal and town governments and in part by the several state governments in the German federation.

Thus comes to an end the first chapter of one of the greatest and most distinctive American efforts in organized philanthropy abroad. It is estimated that more than a thousand tons of food-stuffs have been transported from America and used in the "Quakerspeisung"—as the feeding is called in German—since the beginning of the work; the value of these food-stuffs is over 5 million dollars. Of this sum almost half has been provided by the American Relief Administration whose chairman is Herbert Hoover; the rest has come directly from the hands of the American people,—from people of every class and creed and from all parts of the United States,—who have been touched by the appeal of starving childhood in the vanquished countries of central Europe. The activity of many German-Americans and of the large German-American organizations throughout the United States, especially their three million dollar campaign during the last few months has made it possible to guarantee the feeding of at least five hundred thousand children daily until August first, next, and has supplied, in addition, fifty thousand dollars for the purchase of clothing. Even more than this amount has been promised and the clothing "action" is already well under way. Large orders of underclothing and stockings have been contracted for by the Friends representatives still in Berlin for immediate delivery. The clothing will be distributed at much less than cost price to the poorest of the urban population through municipal welfare centers. The Quaker relief work in Germany will continue, therefore, although under German management, for several months.

The Quakers, by reason of the unique spirit and adaptability of their relief work, and primarily because of its single-minded humanitarianism, have won almost universal commendation in Europe ever since they first undertook the amelioration of the conditions of French civilian refugees who were fleeing before

the German invasion of Northern France in 1917. Not only did the Friends provide temporary shelter and food for these bewildered French peasants who exhibited amazing fortitude and tenacity in returning to their ruined homes a few hours after the departure of troops but hospital and ambulance work and the actual restoration of houses in the devastated area also was performed by the volunteers serving under the Quaker star. Numbers of these volunteers for this extremely difficult and in places highly dangerous labor were conscientious objectors paroled to this service by the War Department. Life in the region immediately behind the shifting war-front was a nightmare of disorder and dirt and disease but, at the urgent request of the French military governor of the fortress of Verdun, the Friends units did not hesitate to undertake the reconstruction of a large area in that devastated region immediately after the armistice. Several hundred frame buildings were erected suitable for dwellings and other necessary purposes, a chain of co-operative village stores was established and supplied with all necessary agricultural implements, household utensils and seeds, scattered families were reunited and a fight against disease and dirt was carried on unremittingly. Upon the completion of this great undertaking in social and physical reconstruction, the Friends founded a much-needed maternity hospital at Chalons-sur-Marne, which they still maintain, and withdrew from France, carrying with them the eloquently expressed thanks of the French authorities and people.

Not satisfied with the enviable record which they had made in France during the war and after, the American Friends organization was the first foreign relief agency to enter Germany after the armistice. Probably the first Americans not connected with either the army or the newspapers—certainly the first American women—to cross the Rhine and enter Germany after the flight of the Kaiser and the establishment of the German Republic were two representatives of the American Friends—Miss Jane Addams of Hull House, Chicago, and Miss Carolena Wood, of Mt. Kisco, New York. Entering Cologne in the spring of 1919, these two American women proceeded through the Rhineland, visited cities in Wurttemberg, Bavaria and Saxony as well as Berlin and Leipzig, talked to mayors and health authorities and doctors and professors, some of whom were acquaintances of former years, inspected schools and hospitals and orphanages, and saw with their own eyes the crippled and diseased children, the deadly ravages of tuberculosis among the working-classes and the widespread improverishment and misery which the long-drawn war and starvation blockade had wrought among all classes of the German population. Most moving of all, perhaps, to these American investigators of long experience in social service and investigation was the hopeless suffering of the old and the physical and mental weakening and warping of the very young upon whom the future of a considerable part of human civilization depends. Upon the return of Miss Addams and Miss Wood to Philadelphia they made a valuable report to the committee that had sent them in which they urgently recommended a great American effort of organized relief among the people whose suffering they had seen, not because these people were Germans but because they were suffering human beings who knew little about the causes of the war and like everybody else believed that they had been attacked, who felt kindly towards the rest of the world and wondered why it hated them, and who had been caught and broken by a great disaster which they were powerless to prevent or even to understand.

The report was read and with characteristic American promptness it was acted upon. Herbert Hoover, who at that time was closely associated with the Allied Supreme Council in Paris in control of the world's grain supply and who was not prepared to enter Germany with his own relief organization to do what he had done with so much success in Belgium, offered financial assistance to the Friends and offered to deliver the food-stuffs destined for starving German children under their administration to the wharves in Hamburg in ships of the Grain Corporation, free of cost to the Friends. His offer was accepted upon the understanding that no hampering restriction would be placed upon the conduct of the Friends relief work and that no consideration save the physical need of the child, to be determined by medical examination wherever possible, would be allowed to determine the selection of the children who should receive the "Quakerspeisung."

Mr. Hoover made good his promise; large sums of money were put at the disposal of the Friends from time to time. The American people responded generously to the Friends' published appeals and the first unit of the relief mission to Germany arrived in Berlin January 3, 1920, headed by Alfred G. Scattergood of Philadelphia, and was received by President Ebert. Beginning in the poorer sections of Berlin and a few other large cities, local committees were organized representing large religious and political groups for the purpose of arranging and administering the local preparation and distribution of the food, kitchens were set up, warehouses established (the great cement warehouses of the Hamburg-American Line in Hamburg were placed at the disposal of the Friends), doctors were summoned who would conduct physical examinations in the schools, and all the details of transportation were arranged both over the railroads and within the cities. It was an enormous task and could not have been accomplished by any group of foreigners without the closest and most cordial co-operation on the part of thousands of German citizens and officials.

From the beginning the German government offered free transportation not only for the food-stuffs from Hamburg to the different cities of the country but also for the Quaker personnel when traveling upon business of the mission. The cities and towns provided local transportation for the "thermos" metal food containers (some of them taken over from the German army commissary) containing the cooked food from the central kitchens to the feeding-centers which, for the sake of convenience and efficiency, were usually located in the places where the children were to be found, in the schools. Sometimes this local transportation was accomplished by municipal street cars, sometimes by automobile trucks. In Brunswick and one or two other places trucks belonging to the city's fire-department delivered the big cans and in old Dresden dog-teams were used. One of the "sights" of Essen during the last two years has been the daily departure of special street cars from the car-barns labelled with signs carrying the Quakers' red-and-black star and the wording: "Amerikanische Kinder-

hilfsaktion—Quakerspeisung." Into the distant hill-towns of southern Saxony—the land of the toy-makers—the food was carried in winter by sledges, for some of the worst conditions of famished and faded children, rickets, tuberculosis and anaemia, prevailed throughout this barren borderland.

So the good work grew. The great ships anchored at the wharves of the Hamburg-American Line, disgorged their precious cargoes of flour and rice and beans and sugar and condensed milk and returned to America for more. The long trains of diminutive freight cars pulled out of Hamburg—sometimes four hundred carloads a month—carrying the food all over Germany. A million children in kindergartens and schools and orphanages and hospitals from Königsberg and Danzig on the "Amber Coast" of the Baltic, to Munich in southern Bavaria, from the sleepy town of Tilsit on the Russian border, where Napoleon met the Czar Alexander on a raft in the river Niemen, to Essen and Cologne and Coblenz and Manheim on the storied Rhine whose important bridges are occupied to-day by Belgian and French and British and American soldiers—in sixteen hundred cities and towns more than a million undernourished, anaemic German children ate Quaker "chow" once every day when the work was at its climax, and they or their parents blessed every night in their prayers the land that sent it and the people who brought it.

In several German cities it was heard recently that the children were saying to each other, instead of "Hans, hast du schon gegessen?" (Hans, have you already eaten?) "Hans, hast du schon geQuakert?" And among the tens of thousands of "thank you" letters that have come from German children and that are now on file in the headquarters of the Friends in Berlin and Philadelphia there is one that reads as follows (it came from a ten-year-old and was written in English):

> Dear Friends:—Oh! how I thank for what the good Quakers have done on me! And when I grow up and am strong and if the American children are hungry and suffer, I will come and help you. God bless you and your friends!

And now, so far as the Friends are concerned, it is almost over, save for the thanking, which continues and will continue for a long time. They are going home. Many of them are going to Russia where their experience and devotion will count for much in the forces that are being mobilized to fight back the invisible but deadly onslaught of cholera and typhus and other dread "Horsemen of the Apocalypse" who ride in the wake of famine and war and who are even now battering down the quarantine barricades that have been hastily erected against them—threatening daily to cross, and in fact already crossing, the frontiers of western civilization through the disorderly gates of eastern Poland into the cleaner lands beyond. A real war is on and in earnest, the warfare of humankind with its ally of applied science against the deadliest foes of Nature—the pathogenic bacteria—that strike and strike down, travelling in dirt and vermin and in the clothes of thousands of refugees who are streaming back after years of exile in eastern Russia to what were once their homes on the frozen White Russian plain, now incorporated in expanded Poland. These people who are driven by famine in tens of thousands, are traveling in box-cars from the Volga basin to the Polish frontier, many of them dying en route. Only this week a trainload of them arrived at Baranowicze where the Poles have established a totally inadequate receiving and quarantine station, with the tale that five hundred people had died and been carried off and hastily buried, or left unburied, since the train's departure from the Volga three weeks before.

A great fight is on all the way from Minsk to Moscow and beyond and the Quakers are in the van of the slender but heroic army of defense upon whose successful resistance and advance the security and health of all of us may depend. The leaders of that column are already falling at the front; three of the Quaker representatives in the Volga country are ill with typhus and one of them, an English nurse, is dead while Anna Louise Strong, a noted newspaper woman from Seattle who went to the Volga for the Friends to study the refugee problem at its source, is slowly winning her way back to health in Moscow after a bout with typhus that was all but fatal. I expect to see her at the Russian frontier and to get from her the story of her sufferings and the latest news from the hunger-front on the Volga where the Friends' outpost is now cut off by terrible blizzards and is calling by telegraph for reserves of personnel and supplies of food and clothing and medicines. The Quakers are going from Germany but they are not going back. They are going forward to new human victories, "Down with politics and intrigue and hating!" say the Germans. "Long live the Quakers, the Quaker spirit and the Quaker star!"

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

Colonel Charles Young

To-day I attended services memorial to Col. Charles Young, U. S. A., who died in Lagos, West Africa, in January. There was a splendid attendance of colored men and women, with a sprinkling of whites. Representatives of various military organizations participated and an elaborate program was carried out in which tribute was paid to the memory of a truly great man. Telegrams and letters were read from various personages, among whom were President Harding and General Pershing. The great meeting here was but one of many held throughout the United States. The date for this general showing of respect was fixed upon the fifty-eighth anniversary of the hero's birth. Well might our nation thus publicly and widely do honor to an extraordinary man who had rendered long and loyal service; well might the colored people of America meet to show their appreciation of a member of their race who had demonstrated many of the highest human qualities.

I first met Charles Young in 1912, when, as a captain in the United States Army, he was serving as military attaché of the American Legation at Monrovia, Liberia. Arriving as an entire stranger in the little capital of the black republic, I found that arrangements had been made for me to lodge in his house. This was one of those large, substantial brick houses of southern plantation type, which were formerly in vogue in Liberia. I was received with the warmest hospitality. The best room was given to me; everything possible was done for my comfort; I was

made to feel completely at home and during the six weeks of my stay every assistance was rendered to me in my work. During those weeks of daily contact, my respect and affection for him deepened. I saw him under all circumstances and conditions. I came to know of his past experiences, his then present efforts, and his plans and hopes for the future. The difference in our years was not great, but it was just sufficient to give him, I believe, something of the feeling of respect and consideration for me that a younger man may have for a father or a teacher, and he honored me with his confidences and soliciting of counsel.

I was in his house on the day when his commission as Major arrived and the communication was opened in my presence. I was the first to see the document and to offer congratulations for the eminently deserved advancement. Later, of course, he was made Colonel —an exceptional, almost an unique, honor for a colored man in the United States army. When the great war came, Colonel Young was anxious to go to the front. His desires were not gratified. I have in my possession a letter in which he told me of his disappointment. Had he gone to the field of battle, he might have rendered similar distinguished service to that which he gave in the Spanish-American war, in the Philippines, in the push into Mexico. That would have called for recognition, for advancement to a generalship—and, in those days of high and sounding democracy, a negro General in our regular army would have been awkward and undesirable. So he was found unfit for active service, and, though probably as physically qualified as ever, he was kept on this side. Put in charge of the negro soldiers at Camp Grant, Illinois, he had the thankless duty, among other things, of conducting one of the most unpleasant courts martial in our military history.

Colonel Young was a man of quick and alert mind. A great reader, he had even in Africa a library of many volumes including the best authors. He was an able conversationalist. For music he has the passion so frequent in his race. At Monrovia, he had an excellent piano which was kept in good condition (not an easy matter in the damp tropics) and he played classical music of the greatest composers brilliantly. Not infrequently, in the evening, a group of the younger leading men of Monrovia would drop in for an hour or so of singing, while Major Young played the accompaniment. He kept up also with dramatic matters and in the last letter I had from him begged me to send on Bruce Mantell's "Best Plays" of the preceding year.

I understand that Charles Young was one of only three colored men to go through West Point. That he received the appointment shows him to have been a youth of extraordinary promise. That he completed his course with credit speaks no less for his high character than for his scholarly ability. During his years there, a thousand unhappy experiences must have occurred. Unusual self control, remarkable tact, exceptional adaptability were necessary in that sharp test. Of one thing I feel certain. He never lost self-respect. If others sometimes failed to give him the consideration that was his due, it was not he who was humiliated; it was they who lost. There is no question that at the time of graduation he had gained and held the respect of all his fellow-students. After that, in all those years of active service, how many have been the opportunities for clash and trouble. Yet, talking with white officers of the regular army, I have found none except those who spoke of him with appreciation and respect as a man, a soldier and an officer. It is difficult for the colored man who must come into daily, intimate, relations with white men to avoid falling into one of two extreme positions. Either, in his fear of being snubbed or neglected, he assumes an assertiveness that renders him obnoxious—or he becomes servile and cringing. Colonel Young did neither. Proud and sensitive, he fully felt any intended slight or insolence; but he never courted a rebuff by undue familiarity or by interfering beyond what was suitable in the given circumstances. He knew when argument would lead only to disagreement and never argued simply for the sake of argument. No man was more frank and outspoken in presenting points at issue and in stating a cause. As to servility it was completely foreign to his nature. There was nothing of the flatterer or toady about him.

Colonel Young was married and leaves a widow and two children, the older one a boy. Before his appointment to Liberia he was for a time military instructor at Wilberforce University, Ohio. He had a beautiful home at Wilberforce, where I presume Mrs. Young still lives. In 1913, or 1914, when Major Young was in the United States on furlough, having lectured at Springfield, Ohio, I went on the next day to Xenia and Wilberforce, where I visited him and met his family. Not only did this give me the opportunity to see his unusually happy home life; together we looked through the University and saw something of its work. Everywhere, among faculty and students and townsfolk, I found that he was a man honored and respected.

After the war ended, Colonel Young was again sent to Liberia as Military Attaché to the American Legation. In this position, where I best knew him, I most like to think of him. At the time of his earlier appointment there, 1912, the American government had somewhat awakened to its duty and responsibility to Liberia. It had loaned some young American colored officers to the Republic, for the purpose of training and developing a native Frontier Force for Liberian defence. As military attaché at our legation, Major Young was not in charge of these raw native recruits from the tribes of "the bush." But he was deeply interested in the enterprise and his long experience in active army service made him an excellent adviser and helper to the young officers who were actually in charge. The development of this force into a trained body, which should maintain order in the interior of the Republic and, if need be, defend the frontier was to him a cherished ideal. He was interested also in everything that should aid in the national development. He realized the importance of developing and improving roads through the country and urged building of roads as rapidly as possible. He thought deeply and wisely upon Liberian problems. He was ever ready to discuss them and to give counsel and advice to the government officials. Here his tact was much in evidence. He never forced his views, nor assumed the position of captious criticism or of supercilious superiority. To have done so would have rendered him obnoxious and destroyed the force and value of his recommendations. I was glad when I knew of his return there, as I felt the Liberian republic was the safer for his presence. In him that nation, "the hope of the dark continent," had an adviser, whose loss is serious.

For my part I have lost a valued friend. In my large list of acquaintances there are not twelve men for whom I had a deeper affection and a higher respect. He will be missed by many—as a friend, a husband, a father, a son, a soldier, an adviser, a man of vision and ideals. Liberia has lost a wise counsellor; the United States has lost a brave soldier and a faithful officer; his race has lost a trusted leader.

Chicago, March 12, 1922. FREDERICK STARR.

Economic Progress in India

[From a personal letter from Captain J. W. Petavel, lecturer in economics in Calcutta University, and expert on the Poverty Problem of India, I take the following.—DAVID STARR JORDAN.]

You know of course from the papers what the situation is in India. I am more certain than ever that America could render immense help at the present juncture. I may put it more strongly than ever now because I can say that the mischief-makers are at work in America to support the mischief-makers out here, the Indian extremists have got a number of American citizens who I am sure, you will not resent my saying, would be much better occupied looking after your own difficult racial problems, to sign some kind of memorial supporting them in India.

These no doubt well intentioned people cannot know how difficult are the conditions in a country where we have difference of races, caste and creeds. The ordinary person has great difficulties to realize the Indian mentality and the extent to which the Indian is able to believe anything he wants to. There is no doubt this applies in an enormous measure to all of us, but there is no doubt either that it is worse in the case of India than the western mind can easily conceive. Now this particular mentality is no doubt one of the chief reasons for which *as a matter of fact* they have never enjoyed a democractic government, and you see now with this Swaraj they can do nothing better than vote Mr. Gandhi—who has that mentality himself—a dictator.

But all the same I think India's day is coming, and I think that all good people should do their very best to hasten it. India's day is coming for an economic reason. We shall have to re-arrange our social conditions on a more co-operative plan, of that there can be little doubt now, and this is all to the favor of India. India will be strong economically, and through economic strength be stronger than any foreign government. I am as keen on "Swaraj" as anyone; only, being an economist, I see which is the right way and which is the wrong, to go to it.

But, finally, we do not want to know what people are keen on, and what opinions are; we want *facts,* and I will mention a few *facts,* and the way *they* suggest a means that Americans might help us. First of all you see, as a fact, that Calcutta University is doing something that is perhaps unique in the history of universities, in undertaking a great propaganda for co-operation.

You have read some at least of the prints it has issued, and will see very clearly what the reasons are. *If we solve the problem of unemployment India is bound to win her freedom.* The foreign government is impossible without a very great number of India government employees of all kinds, and the people of the country will not serve a foreign government in that way unless compelled to do it by lack of other suitable employment. Now in the opinion of the most eminent authorities on economics India, having extraordinary facilities for organizations essentially co-operative in their nature—as described in the prints issued by the University—might in all probability solve her whole problem of unemployment in that manner. It seems clear, then, that co-operation in that way (in which it could clearly be applied in India) might break the fetters (I may say that we have had just recently very warm appreciations from your Professor Carver, from Professor Gide of Paris, and from Sir Horace Plunkett and what greater authorities could I name). But now India has not only the problem to solve of breaking the fetters, but of organizing herself that she should *remain free.* She has in the past always fallen under any little group of well organized people who have tried to master her. Her whole weakness is in her division of castes and races. *Experience shows* that *economic progress* and *education* are the best solvents for this division—this is fact, not opinion. *Co-operation (in the way we mean that word) gives her the best possible chance of economic and educational progress.*

We, therefore, say quite correctly that co-operation is the sword that could win her freedom and the sword that she could turn afterwards into a ploughshare to have prosperity and with it safety. Now I ask *why should not American universities vigorously second this unique effort of Calcutta University.* You know exactly why one would ask for that support. So *often* people do not see facts of this kind until they find people recognizing them on *all sides;* then at last it begins to dawn upon them that they must open their eyes and see, too. What we want at present is to *show what we are saying, others are beginning to say also,* here then is the chance for American universities to do a great work; and I would point out that what India does in this direction would be useful not to herself alone but to the whole world, as she might give some practical examples that would be worth following for others.

Patriotism

A new patriotism we want, not an appendage, but as a part of ethics and religion. Here is not merely where we eat and sleep and work and travel, but this land is a field of duty; here we are stationed, here we have a task. We are linked to a larger whole than our family or the circle of our business interests. For public ends we are to live. The public service must come to have a dignity and honor in our eyes such as no work on private account can have; and we shall enter it, if to this we are called, as priests might enter a temple, and with thoughts as religious as theirs.

A very different spirit must animate the new religion from that which animated the old. The Stoic maxim and not that implied in the teaching of Jesus must furnish the rule for human life: "The wise man must take part in public life." For through the State rather than through any mythical judgment in the clouds, the ends of justice and right are in an important measure to be worked out.

The Standard. —*William M. Salter.*

Success does not consist in never making blunders, but in never making the same one a second time.

The Rule of Chaos

Cameron Mann, bishop of Southern Florida, has issued a statement in regard to the recent abuse of Rev. P. Sidney Irwin, archdeacon, in charge of the work among colored people at Miami and the east coast of Southern Florida.

Rev. Mr. Irwin was seized, stripped, beaten, tarred and feathered and insulted by a mob of southern white men, who told him that he was thus maltreated because he taught Negroes racial equality.

Bishop Mann denies that Rev. Mr. Irwin had taught racial equality. He pays high tribute to Irwin's personal character, his zeal, his honor, his understanding of Negro temperament.

Bishop Mann himself went to Miami the day following the lynching. It was then that an interesting event happened. "I was consulting with the mayor and the circuit judge," says the bishop, "when the commander of the American Legion came in and stated that he had reliable information that if Archdeacon Irwin remained in the city he would be lynched, and that in all probability the church property would be burned and numerous lives lost. He therefore asked that the archdeacon should agree to leave the city that afternoon."

Bishop Mann then asked his aid to leave the city. He asked the citizens of the town to raise a purse to pay Irwin's expenses. This was ignored. Bishop Mann then gave his personal note for $500 and Irwin, with his daughter, left.

The whole colossal injustice and revolting lawlessness of the episode should sink into the mind of every American. Here was a man doing a good piece of work. He was harming no one. He was aiding many people who needed aid. He was guiltless of any crime. He was set upon by ruffians and forced out of his work, and his town.

Has any investigation started at Miami? Has anyone taken the trouble to inquire of the commander of the American Legion where he got his reliable information that Irwin, if he stayed, would be lynched?

The Social Preparation. *M. H. Hedges.*

CORRESPONDENCE

Learning Through Experience

February 25, 1922.

Dear UNITY:—

Thanks for the free copies of UNITY. I am greatly pleased with the *tone* of what is said. The older I grow the more I see that words are far less important than the tone in which they are voiced; and that *what* people believe or think they believe counts for much less than *why* they believe. I want greatly to render all the help I can to promote the ideals of "Unity—Fellowship" and you may count me as an Associate if you so desire. Whether or not, I *do belong* to the spiritual fellowship of the world which never disowns or disregards any soul for any cause. It will be my pleasure from time to time to send you some simple contribution to your work. I wish it could be money, but will try to make it worth more than money.

I live both physically and spiritually where there are few if any clouds—nothing at all of unrest or bitterness. Being out of the world has enabled me to discover how very dear the world is. In great quietness I have been more truly instructed than ever I was in the turmoil of an active life. I have learned to feel my unity with those from whom in other days I had been most inclined to draw apart. Nothing human is evil to me and I love most where there is most need of love. Of all that has ever come to me I rejoice most in those experiences which have taught me how limitlessly much of good good people overlook. One can never truly value the best things in life till he has learned to truly value all things in life even that which is accounted without value. Compassion and tenderness and the blessed gift of forgiveness do not come easily to those sheltered souls who have walked always in safe paths. It is something to be humbly thankful for—whatever it is that draws us into oneness with all souls.

Were I to give you what I count the richest treasure life has brought me it would be this: *Not to learn is the one tragedy of life; but to learn renders all experiences beautiful.*

Crawford, Colorado. VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

The Turkish-Armenian Question

Editor UNITY:

I have before now been struck with the evident bias of Diana Agabeg Apcar's articles in UNITY. There are always two sides to every question, and the Turkish-Armenian question can be no exception to the rule.

If the war has shown us one thing it is that propaganda is a mighty weapon—a sort of a "two-edged sword," someone has recently called it. Propaganda, we have learned, is one of the weapons of Imperialism, and usually the cause that requires its use in the most wide-spread and virulent form is an unjust cause. The very character of a lot of the charges against the Turks leads one to question if there are not "reasons" that do not appear on the surface. Always when there is so evident an attempt to *formulate* opinion, it will be found that there is suppression of the opposite side. I would like UNITY to give the other side of the Turkish-Armenian matter.

If Diana Agabeg Apcar's statements about Turkey are no more true than are her references to Bolshevik Russia, they are not worth the space that UNITY gives to them! And surely it behooves a woman who ends her letter, "It does not pay to hate, but it pays to love" —to write of the Turks and the Bolsheviks in an entirely different way from that taken in her last communication to UNITY. What right has she to put any nations outside the pale of the "Golden Rule," which she makes use of—apparently—in order to get recognition for her article! May we not ask her to practice what she preaches?

New York. MARY C. TRASK.

AT THE CONCERT.

And every phase of life was there
Within the vibrance of the air
And every conquest known of Men
Was present in the music when
There struck the mighty magic chord
Which spoke to all without a word.

HARRIET LAKE-BURCH.

It is only by labor that thought can be made healthy, and only by thought that labor can be made happy.—*Ruskin.*

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

A TRIBUTE TO E. D. MOREL.

[It is a satisfaction to present herewith the following tribute to our associate, E. D. Morel, of London, written by the late Baron Rosen a few weeks before his death. As evidence from the highest authority of the accuracy of Mr. Morel's judgment in international matters, it is a remarkable document.—EDITORS.]

New York.

Dear Sir,

Having just read your letter of October 29, to *The Nation and the Athenæum* in which you express the view that the legend of the German plot to impose domination over Europe is responsible for the elaboration of the vast punitive mechanism known as the "Treaty of Versailles," and further on that "this dogma of Germany's unilateral responsibility for the war is internationally what the Dreyfus case was nationally for the nation concerned," I cannot resist the temptation to assure you—although you may not care to know it—that I entirely concur in these views and that not until they are generally accepted by the whole world, certain German parties themselves included, will real peace in Europe become possible.

It is but quite recently that I acquainted myself with the contents of your admirable books, "Ten Years of Secret Diplomacy" and "Truth and the War," of the existence of which, I am ashamed to say, I became aware only thanks to a reference to them in *The Freeman,* a New York weekly. You will not take it amiss, I feel sure, if a man who has spent a lifetime in the diplomatic service of his country ventures to express to you his profound admiration for the high sense of duty to your country and people which prompted you, and for the civic and moral courage which enabled you to give to the world the unvarnished truth about the real origin and causes of the world war, and if he takes the liberty to add that he subscribes unreservedly to the views you entertain in regard to the nefarious character of the policies practiced by the so-called statesmen of the leading nations of Europe during the decades preceding the advent of the catastrophe. In my reminiscences which have been running in the Philadelphia *Saturday Evening Post*—the most widely read and popular American periodical—under the title "Forty Years of a Diplomat's Life," I have endeavored to the best of my ability to shed some additional light on the history of these tragic times entirely in the spirit and on the lines of the writings of Lord Loreburn, G. Lowes Dickinson, and yourself, supplemented by some information in regard to affairs and conditions in Russia which may be of some interest to you. Although anxious to have them come out in book form I have not so far succeeded in finding a publisher willing to undertake its publication either here or in London.

Foreign Affairs. —*Baron Rosen.*

ANNOUNCEMENT.

Woman in the Progress of Civilization.

H. G. Wells has told the story of Man in his "Outline of History." Woman has no real part in it. Wells' World is a world without Woman, except as in a few instances an individual woman appears for a moment. And yet, throughout the whole history of the race, from paleolithic time to the present day, woman has been in the world, and exercised an influence on it.

Woman has not only borne children, but she has helped to shape civilization. She developed all the primary practical arts. Her influence has been felt in art, literature, morals, jurisprudence, and religion. If she did not develop jurisprudence, she has always been a subject of custom and law. If she did not invent art, literature, and religion, she has been a main object of their inspiration.

The history of woman runs back as far as that of man, and is as continuous in the facts it discloses. In Feudal Japan she composed most of the poetry and fiction. In Buddhist India she produced a remarkable book of poetry. In ancient Egypt she was the head of the family and the owner of the house and other property. In the castles of Feudal Europe she originated modern society. In the Renaissance she wielded a great influence on society, art, literature, education, and intellectual progress. In the modern world her position has advanced with every decade, in education, literature, science, and in all fields of human activity.

George Willis Cooke, author of several books of biography and history, is preparing a History of Woman to bear the title "Woman in the Progress of Civilization." In this work the real nature of Mother-right will be discussed. Also how woman has been treated in the Codes of Law, for instance, those of Hammurabi, Manu, Moses, Justinian, and Napoleon. The question will be fully answered, "Why has woman been regarded as inferior to man?" The influence on her position of war, slavery, ancestor-worship, patriarchialism, the headship of man in the family, will be defined.

It will be seen at once that such a work demands enormous research, in a field hitherto almost wholly neglected, that of the study of every phase of history, jurisprudence, and the growth of customs and institutions as they relate to woman.

The purpose of the author is to publish this work within three years. It will be fully illustrated, in order to show the life and activities of women in graphic form.

This circular is sent to a carefully selected number of persons for their consideration. In order to facilitate the publication of this work the author proposes a special autographed edition for those who care to aid him in forwarding its completion.

The work was some time since *accepted by a New York publisher,* who found it able and scholarly; but was withdrawn by the author in order to make it more nearly complete. The special edition will be limited to 40 copies, and will be sent to those subscribing now the sum of $25.00. Subscriptions may be sent to the author, 20 Dundee Street, Boston 17, Mass.

—*George Willis Cooke.*

THE AMERICAN LANGUAGE.

That the divergence between English and American customs and speech is wide but not unbridgable is the opinion of H. W. Nevinson, the English author, as expressed in his review of H. L. Mencken's "The American Language" in the Baltimore *Evening Sun.*

"Long before my first visit to America," says Mr. Nevinson, "(that came only eighteen months ago, for I was born just too late to be a war correspondent in your Civil War), I used to think how interesting it would be to travel in a foreign country like the United States, where I could understand nearly all the language and be usually understood by the inhabitants, in spite of my foreign accent. And so, indeed, I have found it. The country is entirely foreign, the habits are largely different; the mode of thought is not the mode I am accustomed to: the temper of the people is 'un-English' (being docile and amenable to authority). But after a few months' practice I can understand nearly every one, except the telephone girls.

"Like many other people, I have sometimes thought that in a few generations this advantage would be lost, and an Englishman would have to study American as much as he has to study German now, though English and German sprang from the same root and are so closely connected. But after reading Mr. Mencken's fascinating study of both languages, I am glad to think I was mistaken. The divergence is not yet very wide; the breach is easily crossed."

Dr. Marston T. Bogart, Columbia University: "German science will still menace the world's peace unless it is checked by the intelligence of the nations."

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Ready March 18

A New Book by
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
entitled

NEW CHURCHES FOR OLD

This book presents a thorough-going study of the religious situation in America today, with special reference to the community church movement as the constructive force which is opening up a New Reformation. Most of its material is new, and all has been prepared especially for this work. It answers the questions you want answered about our church.

Published by
Dodd, Mead & Co., - New York
$2.00

The Negro and the White

A Study in Race Relations

Is there a growing hostility between the Negro and White races in the United States? Some careful observers think so. Do the teachings of Jesus furnish principles on which friendship between them could be firmly based?

THE WORLD TOMORROW for March will take up these questions. Articles on the contribution of the Negro to American life; the economic cause of Negro subjugation; the poison of race prejudice; the question of racial inferiority, intermarriage, social equality, etc. Reading list and topics for group discussion.

Each month THE WORLD TOMORROW discusses some single subject of outstanding importance.

Subscribe Now ***One Dollar a Year***

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

THE ECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS OF THE CHURCH
By George Willis Cooke
Write for pamphlet to the
Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago
Reprinted from Unity
Price 10 cents. Ten copies, 50 cents

It's a "Case" of Necessity
Your Printing will be above criticism if done by
THE OAKLAND PRESS
728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 0231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

Main Office and Work:
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO